REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 20 remain in this application.

Claim Rejections -35 *USC* § 102

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1 02(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,923,362 to Klosterman.

Regarding claim 10, the office action asserts Klosterman discloses an IRD box with a coordinator which is coupled to a cable box and a DBS system, which integrates the program guide information from the sources together and displays a color which corresponds to each source within the program guide, in response to a user query, (Figure 1 C, column 2, line 65-column 3, line 47, column 4, line 48-column 5, line 14, column 7, lines 4-21).

The office action further asserts Klosterman inherently forms program map information associating a new data identifier with a program listed in the EPG from a second source, as Klosterman discloses using a color to designate program items from each source and discloses that the coordinator creates a structured framework to save the received data (column 5, line 64-column 6, line 3).

Applicant respectfully points out the limitations of applicant's claim 10 are not met by the above cited references to Klosterman's specification, nor are they disclosed or suggested anywhere else in the Klosterman specification. Therefore applicant's claim 10 is patentable over Klosterman's disclosure for the following reasons:

1.) Klosterman lacks disclosure of "allocating a new data identifier" step

The office action cites Klosterman's specification (col 2 line 65). This text states merely "This television guide information can be received from a plurality of sources." The specification continues to describe the various sources.

The office action cites Klosterman's specification (column 3, lines 29- 47). However, this portion of the specification states only "Thus, automatic access to multi-source television schedule guide information is provided. The immediately preceding portion of Klosterman's specification (col 3 lines 45 – 47) explains how such access is accomplished. For convenience, the preceding portion explanation is reproduced below:

> "In creating a merged television guide, **a channel map is created which identifies the channels available on the multiple sources, and identifies their source**. For example, in the case of DBS/local channel implementations, **a channel map is created with both local cable and DBS channels merged. The local channels and the DBS channels are tagged with a source identifier.**

Thus, Klosterman describes creating a channel map identifying channels available on multiple sources and identifies their source. However, no program identification such as a PID is mentioned. Nor is a step of assigning a new PID inherent in identifying sources such as DBS or local cable.

The office action further cites Klosterman's specification (column 4, line 48). This line merely states, "IRD box 28 receives television programs along with other information via, in one embodiment, satellite dish 29. IRD box 28 then provides program schedule information to the system. The schedule information is added to the transmitted signal by the DBS service provider or a company under contract." Thus no part of this disclosure relates to identifying packets in a program data stream, nor is a step of allocating a new data identifier disclosed. Such a step is not suggested or inherent.

2.) Klosterman's use of color to designate a source does not inherently disclose forming program map information associating a new data identifier with a program listed in the second source.

Klosterman's use of color is merely to designate which source, e.g, IRD box, cable box, etc. a channel is associated with.

> "In order to track which channels are available from which sources, a source identifier is located on each channel. Each of the source identifiers may be included in the channel guide information, or the source identifiers may be added by the system based on the origin of the channel guide information. Therefore, if these data are not already provided, coordinator 20 attaches the appropriate identifiers to the received channel guide information. For example, if BATMAN 60 is received through IRD box 28, than BATMAN 60 will have a source identifier for identifying the IRD box 28 located on its channel 58. In the preferred embodiment, the source identifier is not displayed to the user. If desired, the user can program coordinator 20 to display which source the channel is associated with. For example, channels which come from cable box 26 can be colored red in grid guide 50 and channels available from IRD box 28 can be the color green; thus, if desired, the user can easily identify which source is associated with each channel."

Thus Klosterman discloses using color as a source identifier and, as such, the color is neither a "data identifier" nor a "new data identifier".
In contrast, applicant's specification explains what is meant by "data identifier" on page 10 lines 5 – 10,:

> "Controller 115 forms composite program map information for the composite program guide that maps the SPG, DPG and IPG themes and topics to the master set of themes and topics. **The composite program map also associates data identifiers (e.g. PID values) with individual pacektized datastreams that constitute programs listed in the composite program guide.** "

Applicant's specification goes on to explain what is meant by "new data identifier".

> "Controller 115 re-numbers existing data identifiers and creates new data identifiers as required to produce MPEG compatible program map information for both the collated program guide information and the associated program content.

Claims 11-16 depend from claim 10, and therefore each contains the limitations of claim 10 that are not met by Klosterman. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 10 and 11 are novel and unobvious over Klosterman and as such are allowable as originally written.

***Claim Rejections* -35 *USC* § 103**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1 03(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,002,394 to Schein in view of U.S. Patent 5,793,438 to Bedard.

Regarding claim 1, the office action asserts Schein discloses a STB which retrieves program guide information; displays program guide menu icons related to a theme, programs may be sorted by theme or category (Figure 16A, column 6, line 37 -column 7, line 10, column 9, line 21-column 11, line 46, column 21, line 19-65).

Applicant's claim 1 is directed to a method for collating program guide information from a first source. The method comprises the steps of: a) displaying a selectable program guide menu icon; b) collating a category of program guide information items from said first source by a display attribute in response to selection of said menu icon, said display attribute being allocated to said category of program guide information items and said display attribute being common to both said category and to said menu icon; and c) displaying said collated program guide information items.

The office action correctly states Schein fails to disclose collating a category by a display attribute associated to a category of EPG data, i.e., applicant's claimed step of "...collating a category of program guide information items from said first source by a display attribute in response to selection of said menu icon, said display attribute being allocated to said category of program guide information items and said display attribute being common to both said category and to said menu icon..."
The office action states Bedard discloses a receiver with an EPG in which different categories of programming and the icons associated with them are assigned a color (Figure 5, column 2, line 65-column 3, line 11, column 4, lines 11-19, line 49-column 5, line 7).

Therefore, the office action asserts it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Schein to color code different categories of programming as taught by Bedard, thereby enabling a subscriber to readily identify interesting programs in a program guide display.

However, applicant's step goes beyond merely assigning a display attribute such as color to a corresponding category of proramming as is disclosed in Bedard. Applicant's claimed step is "...collating a category of program guide information items from said first source by a display attribute in response to selection of said menu icon, said display attribute being allocated to said

category of program guide information items and said display attribute being common to both said category and to said menu icon..."

Such a step is not disclosed, suggested or taught in Bedard, or in any of the cited references taken alone or in combination.

Claims 2 – 9 depend from claim 1 and therefore contain the limitations of claim 1 that are not met by the cited references taken alone or in combination. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 novel and unobvious over the cited references and as such are allowable as originally written.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,923,362 to Klosterman in view of U.S. Patent 6,002,394 to Schein and U.S. Patent 6,253,188 to Witek.

Regarding claims 17, the office action asserts Klosterman discloses an IRD box with a coordinator which is coupled to a cable box and a DBS system, which integrates the program guide information from the sources together and displays a color which corresponds to each source within the program guide, in response to a user query, (Figure 1 C, column 2, line 65-column 3, line 47, column 4, line 48-column 5, line 14, column 7, lines 4-21).

However, applicant's claim 17 recites "In a video decoder system for receiving program guide information from a first source containing a first code identifying a program category a method for collating program guide information from a plurality of sources, comprising the steps of:
a) converting said first code to a second code in accordance with equivalence mapping information for allocating a category in a master set of program categories to said received program category;

b) sorting and merging program guide information from said first source and a second source according to said master set of program categories; and c) displaying said sorted and merged program guide information.
Equivalence mapping information is described in applicant's specification on page 9 line 20 as relating to "...converting [theme-topic] codes of one service provider, to those of another."

Klosterman does not disclose "converting said first [program category] code to a second [program category] code in accordance with equivalence mapping information for allocating a category in a master set of program categories to said received program category."

The office action agrees Klosterman does not disclose forming a program map with a first code identifying a program category, collating program guide information from variety of sources, and converting a first code to a second code for category information.

The office action asserts Schein discloses a STB which retrieves program guide information, displays program guide menu icons related to a theme, programs may be sorted by theme or category (Figure 7A/B, 16A, column 6, line 37-column 7, line 10, column 9, line 21-column 11, line 46, column 21, line 19-65).

However, Schein does not address the problems occurring in collating information from different service providers, such problems including the fact that different service providers utilize different codes for categorizing different themes and topics, and also utilize different sorting hierarchies.

Therefore, Schein contains no disclosure or suggestion of converting category codes of one service provider to that of a second service provider in accordance with an equivalence map relating the codes of one service provider to another. Thus Schein neither discloses nor suggest a

step "converting said first code to a second code in accordance with equivalence mapping information".

Witek discloses am automated internet classified system which receives classified ads from newspapers which may categorize listings in different forms, the listings are retrieved and then converted to a master set of categories prior to display (Figures 3, 7, 14, 15, column 12, line 49-column 13, line 13, column 18, line 33- 62, column 52, lines 11-68). Therefore, the office action asserts it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Klosterman to identify programming by a category as Taught by Schein and merge and re-categorize the listings as taught by Witek, thereby allowing a user to more rapidly identify programming they are interested in.

However, Witek contains no teaching of converting a code from a first provider to a code of a second provider in accordance with an equivalence map in order to allocate a category in a master set of program categories to a received program category.

Regarding claim 19, the office action asserts Witek discloses the equivalence matching information is stored and utilized on servers 16 and 20 (column 17, line 25-column 18, line 62). However, no disclosure of equivalence mapping can be found in the cited text. Instead the process of record selection in a database is described.

In contrast, equivalence mapping information is described in applicant's specification on page 9 line 20 as relating to "...converting [theme-topic] codes of one service provider, to those of another."

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17 and therefore contain the limitations of claim 17 that are not met by the cited references taken alone or in combination. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 17 – 20 are novel and unobvious over the cited references taken alone or in combination and as such are allowable as originally written.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance of claims 1 – 20 as originally written be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey M. Navon
Senior Patent Counsel

August 12, 2003

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: 8/12/03

Date

Jeffrey M. Navon